Today's Topics:
                                ARRL
                    dual banders (2m & 70cm)
                    FT290R mods wanted !!??!!
                              Mac vs IBM
            The un-net on 10meters on Saturday (1600-1800Z)

Date: 6 Dec 89 17:40:21 GMT
From: bridge2!mips!wyse!pgraham@apple.com (PC-NFS Philip Graham x1124 #)
Subject: ARRL
Message-ID: <2541@wyse.wyse.com>

In article <7327@cbnewsm.ATT.COM> rma@mhgki.ATT.COM writes:
>The ARRL has a lot of volunteer helpers who can do as they please without
>reference to ARRL. So this is probably not ARRL policy, just the views of
>an ASM.

This is correct, it is the views of ONE PERSON. This person speaks with no
authority.

>That being said, I agree with the views expressed. I don't care if
>you like it or not, modification for out of band service (MARS and CAP
>excepted) seems to be illegal.

IT IS NOT ILLEGAL. Owning a piece of equipment that can transmit out of
band is not illegal. USING it to transmit out of band is illegal. Is owning a
old Police radio that I am going to convert for packet operation or to a
repeater illegal? Of course not....

> What gives hams the right to do this? What if
>everyone started carrying around non-type approved radios on police/fire/etc
>frequencies.

If I had a non-type approved radio that could transmit on police and fire
frequencies and a fireperson/police person wanted to use it to save a life,
I would hand it right over and deal with the legal problems later. I would
rather save a life than to worry about this petty issue.

>What if CBers start modifying their radios to operate on 10m.
>Where do you draw the line.

Use your common sense, if it will save a life then bending the rules does not
hurt anyone... CB folks did modify equipment about 12 years ago when the 23
channels got two crowded and as a result additional spectrum was allocated to
the CB service. It was the wrong way, and as I recall it was a big mess.

It is important to remember the following:

1) Ham radio operators in general do not want to loose their license due to illegal operation, so they will not abuse the hobby and will be careful with modified radios.

2) The number of Ham radio operators is SMALL when compaired to other services.

3) We are self policing (SP?). We do not tollerate illegal operation for very long. We do not want the hobby to get a bad name.

4) As I understand the FCC rules, saving life is most important, keeping the rules is seconary.

Now lets not get the FCC to make something illegal that is not a problem just because some of us are "AFRAID" of what "MIGHT" happen....

DE KJ6NN
Phil

Date: 5 Dec 89 23:41:09 GMT
From: csusac!mmsac!david@ucdavis.ucdavis.edu (David Kensiski)
Subject: dual banders (2m & 70cm)
Message-ID: <2831@cygnus.mmsac.UUCP>

Yesterday, my wife asked me what I wanted for Christmas. I told her I wanted a dual band radio for my car. Then she asked what model. All I could say was, "Uh... I remember a Kenwood... or was it Yeasu..."

So, I am looking for information about the various dual band mobile radios that are currently on the market. I would like to know the features and prices, but more importantly, what kind of good or bad experiences have you had.

Thanks.

NOTE: If you reply by mail, please use the path in my .sig, not in the
      header. My header always seems to get screwed up!

--Dave
--
David L. Kensiski, KB6HCN   Martin Marietta Data Systems
Software Engineer   1540 River Park Drive, Suite 213
Phone: (916) 929-8844   Sacramento, CA 95815
UUCP: sun!sacto!mmsac!david   INTERNET: david%mmsac@sacto.West.Sun.COM

Date: 6 Dec 89 03:07:22 GMT
From: guille!johan@cs.orst.edu (Johan K. Reinalda)
Subject: FT290R mods wanted !!??!!
Message-ID: <14248@orstcs.CS.ORST.EDU>

Hi
I have an 'old'(7 years) FT290R from Yeasu, that i bought when i was still living
in
Europe. It is a real nice trig, and has served for a lot of pleasure.
Being curious as I am, I fussed around with it for quit some time now.
Especially the four bits on the cpu that are programmable by hardwiring
the pins on the chip are fun. I have been able to extend the range from
the european 144-146 to 143.5 148.5 Mhz. Also i found a setting that covers
roughly 142 - 149.3 Mhz , but the pll is very 'itchy', and the cpu only allows rx
(tx only in 144-146 Mhz).
I have a few other mods from european magazines, and some stuff i did myself.
Is there anyone around that knows anything about this rig and has done mods
to it ?
I would appreciate (any) new modifications !
(especially in the 1st IF , since it is too wide)

Anyway, any info about the FT290R is welcome !!

Please reply direct to me, and if wanted i'll summarize .

Johan "Big Jo" Reinalda, (WG7J & PA3DIS)   Internet :
'Grad' Electrical Engineering   johan@guille.ece.orst.edu
Oregon State University, Corvallis Or 97330
USPS: 420 NW 9 AT&T: (503) 753-9327   AMPR: [44.26.0.224] or WG7J@KA7VQD
          /*** If it ain't DUTCH, It ain't MUCH ! ***/

Date: Tue, 5 Dec 89 17:42:51 PST
From: Mike Chepponis <k3mc@apple.com>
Subject: Mac vs IBM
Message-ID: <8912060142.AA25869@apple.com>

Actually, you can have the best of both worlds by getting a Mac and running
a program called SoftPC on it. SoftPC completely emulates an XT machine
(in software!), down to the comm ports, v20 processor compatibility, etc.
Currently, SoftPC v1.3 has a Norton SI rating of 5.5 on my IIci, which is
quite respectable.

SoftPC only runs on Mac II, IIx, IIcx and IIci at this time, however, Insignia

Solutions (the maker of SoftPC) promises support for the SE and Portable in
a couple of months.

As for user interface, and the growing amount of innovative software becoming
available, there is no choice: get a Mac!

Note, too, that even though I work for Apple in the Fremont Manufacturing
section, I truly believe that the Mac is superior. I have programmed PCs for
more than 5 years, and know them inside out; I've been hacking on Macs for
only a couple of years, and the more I learn about Macs, the more I like
'em.

And, if you go to your local Mac dealer now, he'll let you carry a Mac system
home with you *for free*! If you like it, you pay for it. If you don't,
you return it between Jan 1 and Jan 15 (I think those are the correct dates
in jan
January that it must be returned by...).

-Mike K3MC

p.s. These are my personal opinions!

Date: 5 Dec 89 23:21:12 GMT
From: cadnetix.COM!cadnetix!rusty@uunet.uu.net   (Rusty Carruth)
Subject: The un-net on 10meters on Saturday (1600-1800Z)
Message-ID: <10468@cadnetix.COM>

Well, I had a pretty good time last Saturday 'doing the un-net', as they
say :-).   I was a little late getting started (10 minutes or so), but finally
made contact with N4XHX and N4CDO at about 1720Z (an hour and a half into
the 'unnet' - and I had only made one previous 10m contact that morning, at
1630Z). Then I stumbled into a 10-10 'net' where I picked up 4 new 10-10
numbers. PRetty interesting, I've finally got to talk to the west coast!

Anyway, the reason for this posting is (1) to make those of you who have not
tried to meet us on 10 on saturday envious enough to get you on the air :-),
and (2) to bring up something I've been thinking about in relation to
the un-net.

It seems to me that the 'upper' end of the novice segment of 10 is pretty
overloaded when the DX starts up. I spent most of my time last saturday
trying to find an open spot to call CQ. It seems to me that the 'lower'
end is a bit less crowded (although I've not spent a LOT of time down
there, it has seemed to me to be less busy when the upper area is packed).

So, the first question is: how about if we move the un-net down to
'somewhere between 28.305 and 28.315 (depending upon qrm)' ?

How many people think thats a bad idea? If I don't get much/any
mail disliking this idea, then lets move on down...

Also, it seems that the conditions are good enough that we might
find it better to move the time range from 1600Z through 1800Z
to 1700Z through 1900Z so that we can involve more of the west
coast stations. However, I'm not real sure yet how that will
impact the east coast folks, so I'm asking for input. How do you
like the idea of moving the time an hour later? (In practice,
I've stayed on at least 2 hours, so I've decided to make the
time range 2 hours. Hope nobody thinks I'm being paternalistic
about the un-net, but since I did sort of start it off and I'm
sort of the 'driving force', I've taken the liberty to propose
changes to it. Anyone else who thinks of improvements, feel free
to pipe up! :-))

So, if you would *stop* checking in to the 'un-net' (whatever it
means to "check in to the unnet" :-)) because of either of these
changes, I'd appreciate hearing from you! Also, the same goes
for if these changes would make you *start* 'checking in'.
In fact, if it would make it 'significantly' easier or harder,
I'd appreciate hearing from you as well.

Thanks, and 73 de rusty n7ikq
---Join the usenet un-net, 28.410 and/or 28.390(+-) 1600Z to 1700Z saturdays!
Rusty Carruth.   Radio: N7IKQ   ^^ or later :-)
DOMAIN: rusty@cadnetix.com   UUCP:{uunet,boulder}!cadnetix!rusty
home: POB. 461, Lafayette CO 80026

Date: Wed, 6 Dec 89 16:05:44 EST
From: tcs@GANDALF.LL.MIT.EDU (Tom Sefranek)
Message-ID: <8912062105.AA19442@GANDALF.LL.MIT.EDU>

>From: Mike Owen W9IP <MROWEN%STLAWU.BITNET@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU>
>Subject: rec.scanners

>Bob, KA1GT, suggests that the voluminous scanner information currently
>occupying the net should be distributed elsewhere. I most firmly agree.

I guess I'd like to see it (also) distributed elsewhere!
O.K. I fought for your right to agree or disagree as you choose. Enjoy!

>This is rec.Ham radio, after all. Scanner fans have every right to air their

>views, discuss whatever they want to, distribute frequencies, etc. But if this
>net is for ham radio, that's what its postings should contain.

In my humble opinion this IS the vast majority of what is posted.

>   I just don't
>have any interest in that topic, and I doubt that most of the amateur radio
>operator readers of the net have much interest in it, either.

Ham radio and it's community of humans share MANY interests (even over the air)
and the hobby seems to support this diversity well. This net is a reflection
of the diverse sensitivities of the entire HAM community, and even "wannabe's".

I'm sorry you don't have any interest in (whatever) topic. But that does NOT
qualify you as the judge of what the rest of the entire ham community is
interested in. I don't want to believe you could be that egotistical!
So let me calmly assure you that I, a ham of 33 years, AM interested in ANY
radio phenomenon, frequency, mode, or use. Just so that you might be aware of
other amateur radio operators who do support the topic. I've seen your position
posted before, and answered before, DELETE the paragraph when you see it mingled
in with "real" ham radio topics.

Or use bandwidth to express your opinion, only don't seriously believe you are
a reflection of "most amateur radio operator readers..."

>This point was at the root of my "who cares?" mini-flame last week. It was
>amusing to see that all the responses in support came via direct e-mail whereas
>all but one of the hate-flames were posted globally. No doubt Bob's (and this)
>posting will generate the same fiery response from our scanner friends.

I hope that my posting is not interpreted as being on of "our scanner friends".
I don't own (or use) a scanner!

>Go ahead, make my day.

I believe it is a duty of mine as a world class ambassidor of radio, to do all I
can to "make your day". I sincerely hope I have, by re-setting your attitude!

73
Tom
WA1RHP

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #982
****